

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 2, 4-9, 15, and 17-22 were pending in this application. All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rauch et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,731,844 (hereinafter "Rauch"). Applicants have amended claims 2, 7-9, 15, and 20-22 to more particularly define the claimed invention. These amendments are fully supported by the specification, and do not add new matter. In particular, support for these amendments may be found throughout applicant's specification, and in, for example, page 10, lines 3-25, page 26, line 22 to page 27, line 6, and FIG. 29. The recitation of support is merely illustrative and is not intended to be exhaustive. Support for these amendments may be found elsewhere in Applicants' specification. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

II. The § 102(b) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-9, 15, and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rauch. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 2 and 15 are directed respectively to a method and a system for presenting program information in a program guide. The program guide includes a program grid having a plurality of program information cells for presenting information associated with a first subset of channel cells and time cells in the program guide. In addition, each of the independent claims requires that the program grid include a navigation cell that is selectable by the user and that is associated with a second subset of channel cells or time cells, the second subset corresponding to programs that are selected to satisfy predefined criteria. In response to receiving a user selection of the navigation cell, the program guide presents in the program information cells program information associated with the second subset of channel cells or time cells. In some embodiments, the second subset of channel or time cells may correspond to programs that are currently being broadcast (see, e.g., claim 7), programs being broadcast on premium channels (see, e.g., claim 8), or programs that are broadcast during a primetime time period (see, e.g., claim 9). Thus, the predefined criteria may be selected from and of the criteria identified in claims 7-9 or any other suitable criteria (see e.g., page 10, lines 3-25). As explained in Applicant's specification (see page 20, lines 23-26), the claimed invention may, for example,

advantageously facilitate the display of various subsets of program information without changing the display mode, and thereby allow for increased user convenience and browsing efficiency.

Rauch fails to teach each and every element of the independent claims. In particular, Rauch does not describe a program guide having a navigation cell selectable by a user to display program information associated with a subset of time cells or channel cells that correspond to programs that are selected to satisfy predefined criteria. In rejecting pending claims 2 and 15, the Examiner alleges that day selector 220, time scroll 224, channel scroll 226, and topics button 254 described in Rauch correspond to Applicants' navigation cell because they "vary the displayed content according to day, time, channel, and topic, respectively." (See Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. First, although Rauch describes scroll bars that enable a user to access other cells in a grid that do not fit within a particular screen display, persons skilled in the art will recognize that scroll bars are not themselves "cells" in a program grid. For example, in Rauch FIG. 2, the grid 210 is defined to exclude time bars 224 and channel scroll bars 226. Therefore the time and channel scroll bars in Rauch are not "navigation cells" in the sense specified in the claimed invention.

Moreover, merely "varying the content" displayed in a grid is not the same as displaying a subset of programs selected to satisfy predefined criteria. Unlike Applicants' navigation cell, the day, time, channel, and topic buttons in Rauch are not associated with any specified subset of programs to any predefined criteria. Rather, these buttons are used by the user to manually progress sequentially through the program guide, relative to the current time or channel being displayed until the user stops the scrolling process (see e.g., Rauch, col. 6, lines 58-67). In contrast, selecting Applicants' navigation cell automatically causes the display of programs that satisfy the predefined criteria, such as programs on primetime channels regardless of the current time or channel position of the display screen, and without further input or intervention from the user (see, e.g., page 10, lines 9-20).

For at least the above reasons, Rauch does not set forth each and every element of amended independent claims 2 and 15, as is required for a rejection under § 102(b). Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claims 2 and 15. The § 102 rejection of claims 4-9, which depend from independent claim 2, and

claims 17-22, which depend from independent claim 15, should also be withdrawn for the same reasons.


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 2, 4-9, 15 and 17-22, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

We believe that we have appropriately provided for fees due in connection with this submission. However, if there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1075 under Order No. 003597-0001-103 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Regina Sam
Limited Recognition No. L0381
Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel.: (212) 596-9000